

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 6, 11, 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the Section 112 rejections. Claims 5 and 6 have each been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and have each been rewritten to overcome the Section 112 rejections. Claims 5 and 6 are therefore allowable.

Claims 2, 8, 11, 15 and 16 have been amended as necessary to overcome the Section 112 rejections and to depend from either claim 5 or claim 6. New claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 6 and mirror claims 2 and 8. Therefore, claims 2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are allowable.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 17 have been cancelled.

Claims 20-28 have also been added. Independent claim 20 is based on original claims 1 to 5. Dependent claim 21 specifies that the counter-stops of the covering caps are formed on the latching lug 74. In corresponding US Patent Application US 2005 50 262653 A1, paragraphs 0019 and 0020, there are described various variant embodiments of the counter-stops on the covering cap that are the subject matter of new claims 22-24.

Claim 20 defines over DE 370 9810 (Egner-Walter). Egner-Walter does not show a supporting element 10 in the manner of a band, but rather a supporting element which has a particular support profile. In addition, the retaining claws 29 of the connecting component 30 act in the longitudinal direction of the wiper blade or of the supporting element and do not, as specified in claim 20, surround the supporting element laterally. Furthermore, the covering hood 36 is only connected indirectly, via the connecting component 30, to the supporting element 10 while the latching lugs 74 according to claim 20 act directly on the supporting element 30. As a result, it is possible to use the cheeks of the retaining claws as stops for counter-stops of the covering hood. In this case, said counter-stops may be independent of the latching lugs or, according to one embodiment of the invention, may be provided on the latching lugs.

It appears the Examiner has incorrectly interpreted the structural element 37 of Egner-Walter as a latching lug. It is unmistakably clear from column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 2 of Egner-Walter that the covering hood 36 is pulled onto the flange 35 of the component 30 and has a peripheral flange 37. With the latter, said covering hood bears tightly against the flange 35 of the component 30. A peripheral flange is not comparable to a latching lug, the action of which is restricted to a small region and does not cover the entire circumference. The differences are clearly apparent from the language of new claim 20.

Wright, EP 0 316 114, does not show any supporting element in the manner of a band. Here too, as in Egner-Walter, the supporting element is a support profile, and specifically is composed of two profile parts. Therefore, the wiper lever of Wright is not comparable to the subject matter of the present application either with regard to the supporting element or with regard to the connecting component.

Therefore, claim 20 and dependent claims 21-26 are allowable. Claims 21-26 also contain additional patentable subject matter.

New independent claim 27 is similar to original claim 9 and defines over the cited references for some of the reasons set forth above. New claim 28 depends from claim 27.

In view of the foregoing, entry of the above amendment and allowance of claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 15, 16 and 18-28 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/david r. price/

David R. Price
Reg. No. 31,557

Docket No.: 022862-1040
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560